changes. He advocates adhering to established rules in the Code, and refers to a new book on plant-feeding mites, jointly-authored by him, which is purported to be world-wide in scope and employs the changed binominals for eriophyid mites. Yet, in this very book, he persists with Keifer (another of the authors) in *not* following the Code regarding family-group names! Also, the book is not as comprehensive for the economically important eriophyids which do not occur in North America as for those that do.

This case is not merely one of divergence of usage between Russian and American specialists, as the comments on it unfortunately suggest. If the recent eriophyid literature from other countries and in other languages is considered, it will be found that Newkirk and Keifer's changes are followed in very few taxonomic or applied papers.

(2) By Dr. D.C.M. Manson, (*Department of Agriculture, Plant Health and Diagnostic Station P.O. Box 241, Levin, New Zealand*)

Having seen Evert E. Lindquist's comments on this name change (*Bull. zool. Nomencl.* vol. 32: 17-18) I would like to say I fully agree with his proposals, and support the retention of the usage of the generic names *Eriophyes*, *Phytoptus* and *Aceria* as known prior to Newkirk and Keifer's 1971 paper.

Lindquist's proposals are logical and common sense ones, whereas although Newkirk and Keifer may be "legally" correct, the introduction at this stage of new definitions for *Eriophyes*, *Phytoptus* and *Aceria*, all standard and well recognized genera, would create considerable confusion to both students and specialists alike.

(3) By Magdalena K.P. Smith Meyer (*Plant Protection Research Institute, Pretoria, South Africa*)

Newkirk & Keifer (1971) published an article containing changes in the nomenclature of some eriophyid species. Shevtchenko (1974) and Lindquist (1975) objected against the changes of the names and the concepts of some of the most important genera and species. They pointed out that the names of many economic important species are subjected to changes and that may lead to confusion among taxonomists and biologists.

Herewith I want to support Shevtchenko's proposal that the previous designations of the type-species of the genera concerned are retained and that the situation is left unchanged as before the publication of Newkirk & Keifer's paper because of the long-established usage of these names.

LITERATURE CITED

NEWKIRK, R.A. & KEIFER, H.H., 1971. Revision of types of *Eriophyes* and *Phytoptus*. Eriophyid studies, C-5, Agric. Res. Serv., U.S. Dep. Agric. : 1-14.

LINDQUIST, E.E., 1975. Comment on the proposed designations of type-species for *Eriophyes* Siebold, 1851 and *Phytoptus* Dujardin, 1851 (Acarina, Eriophyoidea). Z.N.(S.) 2044.*Bull. zool. Nomencl.* 32(1): 17-18.

(4) By G.W. Ramsay (*Department of Scientific and Industrial Research, Entomology Division, Mt. Albert Research Centre, Auckland, New Zealand*)

In response to the various petitions and comments by Keifer, Newkirk, Jeppson, Lindquist, Shevtchenko, Sukhareva and Sapozhnikova concerning the proposed changes with the names of three eriophyid mite genera (published not only in this *Bulletin*, but also in *Canadian Entomologist* vol. 106: 209-212, 1974) I write to support the case developed by Lindquist and Shevtchenko against the proposed changes.

The three names concerned, *Aceria*, *Eriophyes* and *Phytoptus* are widely used and involve species of economic importance as shown by Shevtchenko (*Bull. zool. Nomencl.* vol. 32(2): 91-94, 1975). He lists numerous and important scientific publications in which these generic names have been used in their established sense during the past decade. The